



Soil Erosion

Sheet and Rill Erosion

	Planning Criteria	Planning Criteria Met	
	Screening level: Permanent ground cover $>$ 90% and slope $<$ 10%. Assessment level: The water erosion rate is $<=$ T.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation To	est Met
	Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.	Yes	No 🗌
	Plant cover controls active erosion (shallow <1 foot deep rills/gullies) and runoff from normal rain events. No litter dams or terracettes are present.	Yes	No 🗌
W	ind Erosion		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	teria Met
	Screening level: Permanent ground cover $>$ 90% and slope $<$ 10%. Assessment level: The wind erosion rate is $<=$ T.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation To	est Met
	All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.	Yes	No 🗌
<u>Cl</u>	assic Gully Erosion		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	teria Met
	Screening level: Classic gullies are not present. Assessment level: Classic gully management is adequate to stop the progression of head cutting and widening and are offsite impacts are minimized by vegetation and/or structures.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Test Met	
	Plant cover controls active erosion (gullies <1 foot deep).	Yes 🗍	No 🗌





Streambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels

Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
Screening level: Streams, shoreline or channels are not adjacent to site. Assessment level: Bank erosion is beyond the client's control or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes, AND PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is >= 4.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	est Met
Excluding all fundamentally unstable, natural geomorphic streambanks/shorelines, all streambanks/shorelines on the operation show few signs of erosion or bank failure. Each is stable and protected with natural materials.	Yes	No
All stream and channel banks, pond and other shorelines are stable.	Yes	No 🗌





Soil Quality Degradation

Organic Matter Depletion

Planning Criteria	Planning Cr	iteria Met
Screening level: Permanent ground cover $>$ 80%. Assessment level: The SCI is $>$ 0, OR the PCS - plant cover element score is $>$ = 4 AND the PCS - plant residue element score is $>$ = 4.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation 7	Γest Met
Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.	Yes	No 🗌
Compaction		
Planning Criteria	Planning Cr	iteria Met
Screening level: Soil compaction is not a problem AND activities do not cause soil compaction problems. Assessment level: The PCS - compaction element score is $>= 4$.	Yes	No 🗌
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation 7	Γest Met
Soils are not compacted past a point that limits plant root depth and growth.	Yes	No 🗌





Insufficient Water

Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: PLU is not irrigated. Assessment level: The irrigation system components and management result in a Farm Irrigation Rating Index > 60 AND meets applicable State in-stream flow and lake and pond water levels requirements.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	An irrigation water management plan is followed that: -meets the forage's needs, while maximizing irrigation water efficiency, -schedules water application based on soil moisture monitoring and/or evapotranspiration monitoring, -measures and records the amount of water you use to irrigate as it comes onto the farm and goes to each field, AND -the system's distribution uniformity has been evaluated and necessary changes were made.	Yes	No
Inc	efficient Moisture Management		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: Moisture management is not a problem AND activities do not cause inefficient moisture management problems. Assessment level: The PCS - compaction element score is >= 4 AND the PCS - plant cover element score is >= 4.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Predominate plants are adapted to the site, usual rain fall, and are useful as intended.	Yes	No 🗌





Water Quality Degradation

Pesticides in Surface Water

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize surface water impacts.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	A site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies are applied. If pesticide application is required, an environmental risk screening tool is used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool) and application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.	Yes	No
<u>Pe</u>	sticides in Ground Water		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize ground water impacts.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	A site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies are applied. If pesticide application is required, an environmental risk screening tool is used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool) and application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.	Yes	No





Nutrients in Surface Water

Planning Criteria	Planning Cri	iteria Met
Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND grazed PLU is not adjacent to streams, ponds, or lakes AND there are no confined livestock areas. Assessment level: The PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is >= 4 AND the PCS - livestock concentration areas element score is >= 4, OR Nutrients are applied and based on a soil test, tissue test or nutrient budget.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation T	est Met
If nutients are applied, they do not degrade surface/ground water quality. Water use is not limited.	Yes	No 🗌
Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas	Yes	No 🗌
Nutrients in Ground Water		
Planning Criteria	Planning Cri	iteria Met
Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND grazed PLU is not adjacent to streams, ponds, or lakes AND there are no confined livestock areas. Assessment level: The PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is >= 4 AND the PCS - livestock concentration areas element score is >= 4, OR Nutrients are applied and based on a soil test, tissue test or nutrient budget.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation T	est Met
If nutients are applied, they do not degrade surface/ground water quality. Water use is not limited.	Yes	No 🗌





Excess Pathogens and Chemicals from Manure, Bio-solids or Compost Applications in Surface Water

Planning Criteria	Planning Cri	teria Met
Screening level: Potential sources of pathogens or pharmaceuticals are not applied on the land. Assessment level: Organic materials are applied, stored, and/or handled to mitigate negative impacts to surface water sources.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation T	est Met
Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas	Yes	No 🗌
Manure, compost, or biosolids are applied per their test report. Grazing management optimizes applied products.	Yes	No 🗌
xcessive Sediment in Surface Water		
Planning Criteria	Planning Cri	teria Met
Screening level: Permanent ground cover $> 90\%$ and slope $< 10\%$ AND classic gullies are not present AND streams or shoreline are not on or adjacent to site. Assessment level: Upslope treatment and buffer practices address concentrated flows to water bodies AND the SVAP2 - bank condition $>= 5$ AND the livestock and vehicle water crossings are stable AND The water erosion rate is $<= T$ AND wind erosion rate is $<= T$.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation T	est Met
Plant cover controls active erosion (shallow <1 foot deep rills/gullies) and runoff from normal rain events. No litter dams are present.	Yes	No 🗌





Air Quality Impacts

Emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

Planning Criteria	Planning Cr	riteria Met
Screening level: Activities are not present that produce GHGs emissions. GHG producing activities are: Fertilization(manure/commercial), CAFO/manure management, Engines (combustion source), Tillage, AND GHGs are not regulated in this planning area. Assessment level: Greenhouse gas emmissions are managed to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation '	Test Met
Forage Supply and Demand Balance is achieved.	Yes	No 🗌





Degraded Plant Condition

Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Assessment level: The PCS is 30 or above. Plants are adapted to the site, meet production goals and do not negatively impact other resources.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.	Yes	No 🗌
<u>Ex</u>	xcessive Plant Pest Pressure		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: Plant productivity is not limited from pest pressure. Assessment level: The PCS - insect and disease pressure element score is >= 4 AND the PCS - site adaptation element score is >= 4.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Plant growth and cover is managed as to inhibit pest plant introduction.	Yes	No 🗌





Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat

Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter

Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
Assessment level: The WHSI rating is >= 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is >= 7 AND the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is >= 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is >= 7, OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR cover is of available quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
The plant cover provides cover and shelter for the chosen wildlife species.	Yes	No
Inadequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)		
Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
Assessment level: The WHSI rating is >= 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is >= 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is >= 7, OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR The connectivity of habitat components are adequate to support stable populations of targeted species.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
Plant cover provides space for wildlife species.	Yes	No 🗌
Connectivity between food resources and cover and shelter is provided for the chosen wildlife species. <see action="" plan="" state="" wildlife=""></see>	Yes	No





Livestock Production Limitation

Inadequate Feed and Forage

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifer, livestock forage, roughage and supplemental nutritional requirements addressed.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	The existing feed/forage quantity/quality meet the livestock needs and goals.	Yes	No 🗌
In	adequate Shelter		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifer, artificial or natural shelters meet animal health needs and client objectives.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Evaluation Tests Livestock have adequate shelter.	Yes	st Met No
In			
In	Livestock have adequate shelter.		No 🗌
<u>In:</u>	Livestock have adequate shelter. adequate Water	Yes	No 🗌
Ins	Livestock have adequate shelter. Adequate Water Planning Criteria Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifer, water of acceptable quality and quantity adequately distributed to meet animal	Yes Planning Crite	No





Inefficient Energy Use

Farming/Ranching Practices and Field Operations

Planning Criteria	Planning C	riteria Met
Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation	Test Met
Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.	Yes	No